

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the previously-filed Information Disclosure Statement (IDS).

Claims 1-18, 22, 23 and 36-44 were previously withdrawn, while claim 21 was previously canceled, leaving claims 19-20 and 24-35 pending in the instant application.

In response to the Final Office Action dated May 21, 2009, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on at least the following remarks, and respectfully submit that the claims as presented herein are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 19-20 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hirano et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,277,075, hereinafter “Hirano”) in view of Takayama (U.S. Pat. No. 6,317,157, hereinafter “Takayama”) in view of Murdoch et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,897,876, hereinafter “Murdoch”) and further in view of Kimura (U.S. Pat. No. 6,475,845, hereinafter “Kimura”). Specifically, regarding independent **claim 19**, the Examiner states on pages 2-6 of Office Action that Hirano, Takayama and/or Kimura teach all elements of claim 19 except to “define the predetermined value in such a way that the white extracting part generates the predetermined value as the white color component if the minimum value is larger than the predetermined value...[or] that the display device is an organic electro-luminescent display (OLED) device comprising an OLED panel,” which the Examiner further states is taught by Murdoch, primarily at: FIG. 2; column 1, lines 14-48; column 6, line 56 through column 7, line 60; column 8, lines 4-24; and column 10, line 24 through column 11, line 10. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

Applicants submit herewith a certified translation of the priority document, Korean Patent Application No. 10-2003-0029153, which was filed on May 7, 2003. Because this priority document was filed before June 26, 2003, which is the 102(e) date of Murdoch, Applicants have properly antedated Murdoch. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that all of the Examiner’s rejections in which Murdoch is used as a reference be withdrawn.

More particularly, as a result of antedating Murdoch, Hirano, Takayama and/or Kimura, either alone or in any combination thereof, fail to teach or suggest "...an OELD panel to emit light with a color in response to the four-color signals from the data driving part and the scan signals from the scan driving part, wherein a white extracting part is configured to determine which color data of the gamma-converted RGB data has a minimum value and to compare the minimum value with a predetermined value relative to the maximum gray scale level, the white extracting part generates the minimum value of the gamma-converted RGB data as the white color component if the minimum value is smaller than the predetermined value, and the white extracting part generates the predetermined value as the white color component if the minimum value is larger than the predetermined value," as recited in previously-presented independent claim 19.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 19, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 20 and 24-35, define over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 19-20 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hirano in view of Takayama in view of Murdoch in view of Kimura and further in view of Miller et al. (U.S. PGPub. 2004/0113875 hereinafter "Miller"). Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, Applicants submit herewith a certified translation of the priority document, antedating Murdoch, and thereby respectfully request that all of the Examiner's rejections in which Murdoch is used as a reference be withdrawn.

Additionally, independent claim 19, from which claim 27 depends, is submitted as being allowable for defining over Hirano in view of Takayama in view of Kimura, as discussed above.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the deficiencies of Hirano in view of Takayama in view of Kimura, as allegedly taught by Miller, or any other disclosure of Miller, do not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Hirano in view of Takayama in view of Kimura.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 27 of the present invention is patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hirano in view of Takayama in view of Murdoch in view of Kimura and further in view of Eida et al. (U.S. PGPub 2001/0050532 hereinafter “Eida”). Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, Applicants submit herewith a certified translation of the priority document, antedating Murdoch, and thereby respectfully request that all of the Examiner’s rejections in which Murdoch is used as a reference be withdrawn.

Additionally, independent claim 19, from which claims 28-35 depend, is submitted as being allowable for defining over Hirano in view of Takayama in view of Kimura, as discussed above.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the deficiencies of Hirano in view of Takayama in view of Kimura, as allegedly taught by Eida, or any other disclosure of Eida, do not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Hirano in view of Takayama in view of Kimura.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 28-30 of the present invention are patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion:

In accordance with the foregoing, applicants note that the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested. The Office is invited to contact applicants' attorneys at the below-listed telephone number concerning this Amendment or otherwise regarding the instant application. If there are any charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account no. 06-1130 maintained by applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /Noah J. Hayward/

Amy Bizon-Copp
Registration No. 53,993
Noah J. Hayward
Registration No. 59,515
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street, 22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

Date: August 7, 2009